

REMARKS

Claims 11-21 remain in this application. Claims 1-10 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Reconsideration of the objections set forth in sections 1-2 on page 2 of the Office Action is requested. Locking bars 4 and 5 are already illustrated in the drawing figure, and it is not necessary to show both “open” and “closed” locking bar positions. Attention is directed, for example, to U.S. Patent 4,476,700 to King, which is discussed in section 9 of the Office Action; bolts 17 and 30 of the King bolt lock are shown in a single position only. The other features mentioned in section 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, similarly, do not have to be shown. The informality mentioned in section 2 is eliminated by the drawing amendment noted above, moreover, and it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the drawings are not now applicable.

The informality noted in section 3 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action is eliminated above.

Reconsideration of the rejection set forth in section 5 on page 3 of the Office Action is requested. Claim 9, which reflects features described, for example, in paragraph 0021, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), along with certain dependent claims, as anticipated by Japanese patent document 60-46765. Reconsideration is requested.

As amended above, claim 11 requires at least one of the first and second locking bars specified to include a catch element thereon, and a detent element

secured to the cover that automatically cooperates with the catch element to hold the locking bars in release positions. It is respectfully submitted that the limitations in claim 11 mentioned serve to distinguish the invention now claimed from the prior art relied on by the Examiner. As the Examiner acknowledges in section 12 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Japanese document relied on fails to disclose that locking bars thereof are held in an open position of the cover 3 and then released during a closing movement. It follows, therefore, that the anticipation rejection of claim 11 is no longer applicable.

U.S. Patent 4,478,444 to Kurz et al. is relied on in combination with the Japanese document relied on to reject claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In the Kurz et al. arrangement, when the door 22 is closed, the actuator 51 engages the jamb stop and swings forwardly, allowing the bolt 24 to be shifted to its locking position. The Kurz et al. patent disclosure, however, does not suggest either including a catch element on a locking bar as claim 11 now requires or securing a detent element to a cover that automatically cooperates with such a catch element to hold locking bars in release positions as claim 11 now requires. The other secondary references discussed by the Examiner in sections 9-11 on pages 4-6 of the Office Action also fail to suggest the limitations in claim 11 mentioned above, moreover, and claim 11 above should now be patentable. All other claims in this application are dependent claims and should also be patentable.

This application should now be in allowable condition. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to

the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.57735US).

Respectfully submitted,

March 13, 2009

/Richard R. Diefendorf/

Richard R. Diefendorf

Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd